

**From:** SusanatPGLaw@aol.com [mailto:SusanatPGLaw@aol.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, March 06, 2006 10:57 AM  
**To:** jugoretz@dfg.ca.gov; mlpacomments@resources.ca.gov; Melissa Miller-Henson  
**Cc:** LWillo1124@aol.com; daniel.davis@earthlink.net; susanatpglaw@aolcom; yscuba@californiadivers.com; cdocean@earthlink.net; lisaben@redshift.com; ibmiller@comcast.net  
**Subject:** Re: Question regarding pkg. S and pkg. 3 re: Hopkins Marine Reserve

John:

Thanks for your recent email. I'm curious, who the heck is the "non state initiative staff"? It seems to me that we are hearing from newcomers every day! "Inquiring minds want to know" who these people are, who they represent, what the function of the group is, who appointed them and why were they appointed?

The other thing I am interested in, is how the State Fish and Game can give a private entity, Stanford's Hopkins Marine Station, dominion and control over Pacific Grove property including what appears to be a proposed delegation of police powers by way of issuing permits to this entity. (Plan 3 and S).

Is this something that is done by the State in terms of these private Reserves. If Hopkins is going to be the policing authority, what criteria are they going to use?

John, we are in total agreement and so are most residents of Pacific Grove as to your comment "we recommend that these areas be included with the offshore area in a single MPA. If the intent is to protect all intertidal invertebrates, then we recommend no invertebrate take be allowed in the entire area. If the intent is to protect all invertebrate life (fish, algae and invertebrates, then we recommend a "no take' reserve in the whole area."

This is the position of the Tidepool Coalition and most people in Pacific Grove, but I see this sentiment nowhere in any of the proposals now being offered to the BRTF panel. Perhaps you could offer some explanation as to why?

As I said at the recent P.G. Council meeting, the protection of the resource is to be paramount over the special interests of stakeholders regardless of how worthy. That is unquestionably the legislative purpose of the MLPA which the State Fish and Game Commission and its delegates are tasked to implement.

As I also mentioned at the meeting, these precious resources have been shared to death, and our legislature has recognized it is time to put the long term interests of preserving these magnificent ocean resources as the highest priority.

I would appreciate an early response, and I would also like my comments here to be passed on to the Blue Ribbon Panel.

Susan Goldbeck  
P.G. City Council